

**Remarks**

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of **December 1, 2004**. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-33** is respectfully requested.

**Summary of The Office Action**

**Claims 1-33** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as this invention.

**Claims 1-33** were indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

An Information Disclosure Statement was filed on December 8, 2004 that cited references from a United Kingdom Search Report dated November 11, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests the cited references be considered in the next office action since the IDS was timely filed.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

**Independent claim 1**

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the media registration mechanism is configured to selectively drive one or more of the plurality of media carriers at different speeds in order to selectively steer the print media. Since claim 1 recites an element for driving the media carriers, Applicant believes that the claim is definite and complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**Claim 9**

Claim 9 has been amended to eliminate the purportedly unclear language identified by the Examiner. Claim 9 should now be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 12

Independent claim 12 was rejected because it was not understood how the media carriers are driven at a first and second speed ratios due to insufficient structure of the drive mechanism. Applicant submits that this language is a functional limitation, which is permitted by MPEP 2173.05(g). This section of the MPEP allows an element to be defined by what it does, rather than by what it is, and allows an element to be defined by a particular capability or purpose that is served by the recited element.

One or ordinary skill in the art would understand that there are many different structural configurations and many different mechanical and/or electromechanical elements that can be used to drive the media carriers in the recited manner. Applicant does not intend to limit claim 12, or other claims, to a specific configuration. As stated previously, MPEP 2173.05(g) allows an element to be defined functionally rather than with a specific structure.

Applicant believes that the language of claim 12 is definite since it defines how the drive mechanism functions and defines its capability. Therefore, claim 12 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the rejection should be removed.

Independent claim 19

Independent claim 19 was rejected since “dynamically configurable” is purportedly vague. Claim 19 has been amended to recite that the alignment mechanism being capable of aligning the print media against a selected alignment wall... As previously described, MPEP 2173.05(g) allows an element to be described with functional limitations that define a particular capability. Claim 19 is defined in this manner and is believed to be definite. Thus, claim 19 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the rejection should be removed.

Dependent claim 21 has been amended to recite a means for selectively operating the plurality of belts. Claim 21 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the rejection should be removed.

Claims 24-26

Independent claim 24 defines the media registration mechanism using functional limitations that define the capability of operating the media carriers at different speeds. Claims 25 and 26 also use function limitations. MPEP 2173.05(g) allows functional limitations without specific structure. Applicant believes the functional limitations are clear and definite so that claims 24-26 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.


Independent Claim 29

Claim 29 is a method claim. Some structure is used to define the context in which the method can operate. However, claim 29 is not directed to a product and applicant believes that claim 29 does not claim both a product and a process of using the product as described in MPEP 2173.05(p). Therefore, claim 29 is believed to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1-34** are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PETAR Kraguljac (Reg. No. 38,520)  
(216) 348-5843